

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

**IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FIFTH APPELLATE DISTRICT**

In re B.B., a Person Coming Under the Juvenile
Court Law.

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

B.B.,

Defendant and Appellant.

F077857

(Super. Ct. No. 18CEJ600223-1)

OPINION

THE COURT*

APPEAL from an order of the Superior Court of Fresno County. Houry A.
Sanderson, Judge.

Kristen Owen, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and
Appellant.

Office of the State Attorney General, Sacramento, California, for Plaintiff and
Respondent.

-ooOoo-

* Before Detjen, Acting P.J., Smith, J. and DeSantos, J.

The court adjudged appellant B.B. a ward of the court after it sustained allegations in a petition (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 602) charging her with first degree burglary (Pen. Code, §§ 459/460, subd. (a)). Following independent review of the record pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, we affirm.

FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

On April 20, 2018, in the afternoon, when A.S. and two of her siblings arrived home from school, they found the backyard gate ajar. Inside the house, A.S. found her clothes had been taken out of her dresser and were on the ground, the mattress on her bed had been moved, and money was missing from the top of her sister's dresser. A.S. immediately called her father, David S. (David), and her mother and they came home and called the police. David found two of his watches missing from his dresser.

A neighbor's security camera recorded a car earlier that day that drove several times around the block before parking in front of David's house. A female walked from the car into the backyard and exited a short time later. Two male suspects then got out of the car and the trio entered the house through the front door. Sometime later, the trio walked out of the house, got into the car and left.

A.S.'s father, David, obtained a copy of the surveillance video from his neighbor. Upon viewing it, he recognized the female as appellant, who was his niece. David showed the video to A.S. Although the video was blurry, A.S. recognized the female as appellant, her cousin, from seeing her face in the video and by the way she walked.

On May 1, 2018, appellant's mother called the Fresno Police Department and spoke with Detective James Barnum because she was concerned about the burglary at David's house and had learned that appellant might be involved. Appellant's mother also told the detective that appellant told her she "was sorry for what she did."

Appellant's mother subsequently took appellant to the police station and spoke with Barnum. Barnum showed appellant's mother a copy of the neighbor's surveillance video and immediately she identified appellant as the female in the video.

On May 7, 2018, the Fresno County District Attorney filed a wardship petition charging appellant with first degree burglary.

On May 30, 2018, at appellant's jurisdictional hearing, the juvenile court found the petition allegations true.¹

On June 28, 2018, at appellant's disposition hearing, the court placed appellant on probation through July 28, 2019, and it committed her to the global position system program for a period not to exceed 45 days.

On July 23, 2018, appellant filed a timely appeal.

Appellate counsel has filed a brief that summarizes the facts, with citations to the record, raises no issues, and asks this court to independently review the record. (*People v. Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d 436.) Appellant has not responded to this court's invitation to submit additional briefing.

Following an independent review of the record, we find that no reasonably arguable factual or legal issues exist.

DISPOSITION

The order is affirmed.

¹ Although appellant was eligible for deferred entry of judgment, she rejected two opportunities to be placed in that program.